



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/898,480	07/05/2001	Tomas Andreason	1410-762	8452
7590	04/05/2004		EXAMINER	
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C. 1100 North Glebe Road, 8th Floor Arlington, VA 22201			LELE, TANMAY S	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2684	8
DATE MAILED: 04/05/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/898,480	ANDREASON, TOMAS
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tanmay S Lele	2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Statyus

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 July 2001.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) _____ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) 3,4 and 18 is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.6.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. The disclosure is objected to because it contains an embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. Applicant is required to delete the embedded hyperlink and/or other form of browser-executable code. See MPEP § 608.01.
2. The use of the trademark “BLUETOOTH” has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 3 is objected to because of the following informalities: “trasceiver.” Appropriate correction is required.
4. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: “bluetooth.” Appropriate correction is required.
5. Claim 18 is objected to because of the following informalities: “telepone.” Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 17, it was not understood what, "...in dependence of the message regarding the call," was in reference to. For purposes of examination it was assumed this would be ringing when a call was incoming. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1 – 5, 7-14, 16, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suresan (Suresan, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 98/47300) in view of Haartsen (Haartsen, "BLUETOOTH- The Universal Radio Interface for ad hoc, wireless Connectivity").

Regarding claims 1 and 7, Suresan teaches of an arrangement and method of a telephony system (TS1) including at least one mobile radio telephone for being radio connected to a mobile radio telephony network in the telephony system via a radio link (Figures 1 and 2); and at least one stationary telephony terminal and the stationary telephony terminal is arranged to communicate over the mobile radio telephony network via the mobile radio telephone (starting page 1, line 32 and ending page 2, line 6).

Suresan does not specifically teach of characterized in that the stationary telephony terminal and the mobile radio telephone have each a short range transceiver for intercommunication via a short range wireless communication link.

In a related art dealing with mobile phones, Haartsen teaches of characterized in that the stationary telephony terminal and the mobile radio telephone have each a short range transceiver for intercommunication via a short range wireless communication link (pages 110 – 112).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Suresan's mobile-telephony combination system, Haartsen's local area wireless transceivers, for the purposes of eliminating cables, as taught by Haartsen.

Regarding claim 2, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1. Suresan further teaches of characterized in that the stationary telephony terminal has a device for taking a telephone number to a called subscriber (starting page 4, line 32 and ending page 5, line 8; starting page 5, line 28 and ending page 6, line 10 and page 6, lines 20 – 27 and page 8, lines 4 – 16).

Regarding claim 3, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1. Haartsen further teaches of characterized in that the short range transceivers are radio trasceivers (page 110).

Regarding claim 4, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 3. Haartsen further teaches of characterized in that the short range radio transceivers are bluetooth transceivers (page 110).

Regarding claim 5, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 3. Haartsen further teaches of characterized in that the short range transceivers are optical transceivers (page 110).

Regarding claim 8, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Haartsen further teaches of characterized by the following steps: sending, from the stationary telephony terminal, discovery signals over the short range wireless communication link (page 115 –117); receiving in the mobile radio telephone said discovery signals (page 115 –117); sending response signals from the mobile radio telephone (page 115 – 117); receiving in the stationary telephony terminal the response signals (page 115 –117); and sending a mobile identification signal from the mobile radio telephone (page 115 –117).

Regarding claim 9, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Haartsen further teaches of characterized in that the identification signal includes an individual identification signal for the mobile radio telephone (page 115 -117).

Regarding claim 10, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 8. Haartsen further teaches of characterized by the following steps: sending, from the mobile radio telephone, discovery signals over the short range wireless communication link; receiving in the stationary telephony terminal said discovery signals (page 115 –117); sending response signals from the stationary telephony terminal (page 115 –117); receiving in the mobile radio telephone the response signals (page 115 –117); and sending a mobile identification signal from the mobile radio telephone (page 115 –117).

Regarding claim 11, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 10. Haartsen further teaches of characterized in that the identification signal

from the mobile radio telephone includes an individual identification signal for the mobile radio telephone (page 115 -117).

Regarding claim 12, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 9. Haartsen further teaches of characterized by sending from the stationary telephony terminal an authentication code to the mobile radio telephone (page 117).

Regarding claim 13, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Haartsen further teaches of characterized by taking a service code on the stationary telephony terminal, indicating when the sent authentication code is valid (pages 115-117).

Regarding claim 14, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Haartsen further teaches of characterized by checking the authentication code in the mobile radio telephone (pages 115- 117).

Regarding claim 16, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Suresan further teaches of characterized by the method including the following steps: receiving an incoming call on the mobile radio telephone via the radio link from the mobile radio telephony network (page 7, lines 12 –30) and Haartsen further teaches of transmitting a message regarding the call to the stationary telephony terminal via the short range wireless communication link (pages 115 –117); and establishing a speech channel on the short range wireless communication link (pages 115 –117).

Regarding claim 18, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Suresan further teaches of characterized by the method including the following steps: taking a telephone number on the stationary telephony terminal to a called

subscriber (starting page 4, line 32 and ending page 5, line 8; starting page 5, line 28 and ending page 6, line 10 and page 6, lines 20 – 27 and page 8, lines 4 – 16); transmitting the telephone number to the mobile radio telephone setting up a connection on the radio link from the mobile radio telephone to the mobile radio telephony network in dependence on the transmitted telephone number (starting page 4, line 32 and ending page 5, line 8; starting page 5, line 28 and ending page 6, line 10 and page 6, lines 20 – 27) and Haartsen further teaches of setting up a connection on the short range wireless communication link (pages 115 – 117) and via the short range wireless communication link (page 110 – 111).

Regarding claim 19, Suresan teaches of a stationary telephony terminal (Figures 1 and 2), characterized in that it includes: a controlling device, wherein the controlling device is arranged to support telephony from the stationary telephony terminal over a mobile radio telephony network via said mobile radio telephone (starting page 1, line 32 and ending page 2, line 6).

Suresan does not specifically teach of a short range transceiver for intercommunication with a mobile radio telephone via a short range wireless communication link and connected to the short range transceiver.

In a related art dealing with mobile phones, Haartsen teaches of a short range transceiver for intercommunication with a mobile radio telephone via a short range wireless communication link (pages 110 – 112) and connected to the short range transceiver (pages 110 – 112).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Suresan's mobile-telephony combination system, Haartsen's local area wireless transceivers, for the purposes of eliminating cables, as taught by Haartsen.

10. Claims 6 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suresan (Suresan, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 98/47300) in view of Haartsen (Haartsen, "BLUETOOTH- The Universal Radio Interface for ad hoc, wireless Connectivity") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Uchiyama (Uchiyama, US Patent Application No. 2002/0072390).

Regarding claim 6, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1. Suresan in view of Haartsen do not specifically teach of characterized in that the stationary terminal includes a device for generating a ring signal.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of characterized in that the stationary terminal includes a device for generating a ring signal (paragraph 0049).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Suresan and Haartsen's mobile-telephony combination system, Uchiyama's ringer, for the purposes of being alerted when a call was incoming, as taught by Uchiyama.

Regarding claim 17, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 16. Suresan in view of Haartsen do not specifically teach of characterized by generating a ring signal in the stationary telephony terminal in dependence of the message regarding the call.

In a related art dealing with docking stations, Uchiyama teaches of characterized by generating a ring signal in the stationary telephony terminal in dependence of the message regarding the call (paragraph 0049).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Suresan and Haartsen's mobile-telephony combination system, Uchiyama's ringer, for the purposes of being alerted when a call was incoming, as taught by Uchiyama.

11. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suresan (Suresan, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 98/47300) in view of Haartsen (Haartsen, "BLUETOOTH- The Universal Radio Interface for ad hoc, wireless Connectivity") as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Patel (Patel, US Patent No. 6,118,993).

Regarding claim 15, Suresan in view of Haartsen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Suresan in view of Haartsen do not specifically teach of characterized by checking the authentication code in the mobile radio telephony network.

In a related art dealing with mobile equipment, Patel teaches of characterized by checking the authentication code in the mobile radio telephony network (column 6, lines 1 –9).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Suresan and Haartsen's mobile-telephony combination system, Patel's authentication system, for the purposes of preventing unauthorized usage on the system, as taught by Patel.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Inventor	Publication	Number	Disclosure
Hofman	US Patent Application	2002/0090919	Adapter to convert cell phone to desktop telephone
Helstab et al.	US Patent	6,073,031	Desktop docking station for use with a wireless telephone handset

Art Unit: 2684

Jonsson et al.	US Patent	5,903,833	Method and apparatus for routing calls by remote control
Uratani	US Patent	5,850,593	Mobile communication for a mobile station near or outside a service area of a base station

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

tsl
Tanmay S Lele
Examiner
Art Unit 2684

tsl
March 31, 2004

Nay A. Maung
NAY MAUNG
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER